Rajamantrapravina N. MADHAVA RAU.—The mistake was not known in the beginning. Otherwise it could have been rectified immediately. We had to make enquiries.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Were two months required for this purpose?

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU.—Certain legal questions were involved and to come to a decision on them, it took naturally some time.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Did not the Government know at the time of nomination that he was the head master of a primary school?

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU.—Merely because he was a primary school head master, that was no disqualification for nomination. There were other considerations.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Was any legal advice taken on the matter; and if so, what was it?

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU.—Yes, but the details cannot be disclosed. All things were considered and the nomination was found to be invalid. The other matters are now under consideration.

Mr. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA.—When was the memo passed by the President? Was it after the interpellation was sent to the Representative Assembly?

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU.—Before the interpellation was sent up to the Representative Assembly.

Mr. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA.—Does that not go to show that Government were aware of the fact that he was a primary school head master?

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU.—There was some doubt as to whether a subordinate of the Local Education Authority was disqualified in the same way as a subordinate of a municipal council and whether the two are to be regarded as two different statutory bodies or the same for this purpose.

Mr. PRESIDENT.—In the opinion of Government, nomination is invalid. Government are considering what steps should be taken in the matter.

Mr. K. L. NANJAPPA NADIG.—Whom did Mr. Rangadhamiah succeed and to which community did he belong?

Mr. N. MADHAVA RAU.—Mr. B. L. Maridandiah, an Adikarnataka.

Mr. K. L. NANJAPPA NADIG.—Why was Mr. Maridandiah removed?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—That question does not arise.

Appointment of Dr. Misra as Assistant Surgeon.

Q.—13. **Messrs. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA** (Nagamangala Taluk); **T. MARIYAPPA** (Mysore City Municipality); **B. CHAMIAH** (Seringapatam Taluk); **B. S. PUTTASWAMY** (Nanjangud Taluk) and **SIVANANJE GOWDA** (Mysore Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether they have not appointed one Dr. Misra as an Assistant Surgeon in the Mysore Medical Department and posted him to Krishnarajendra Hospital;

(*b*) whether he is a Mysorean;

(*c*) to what community does he belong;

(*d*) whether there was a vacancy; if so, whether it was advertised;

(*e*) when did he apply for a job and what was the post he applied for?

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, GENERAL DEPARTMENT (Mr. M. Venkatesa Iyengar).**—

(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) No.

(*c*) Brahmin.

(*d*) Yes. Vacancies of Assistant Surgeons are not usually advertised.

(*e*) 20th May 1936, for a post in the Medical Department.

Mr. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA.—With reference to answer to (*d*), was not the appointment newly created?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—No.

Mr. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA.—Was there a vacancy?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—Yes.

Mr. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA.—Why was it not advertised?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—Vacancies of Assistant Surgeons are not advertised. Recruitment in the department for gazetted places is generally to the rank of medical probationers.

Mr. B. S. PUTTASWAMY.—Were no qualified Mysoreans available for the post?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—This gentleman is an F.R.C.S.

Mr. B. S. PUTTASWAMY.—Were not men with the same qualification available in the State?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—No.

Mr. B. S. PUTTASWAMY.—Was there any necessity to appoint a person with F.R.C.S. qualification?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—F.R.C.S. is considered very high qualification and it was thought desirable to take a person when his services were available.

Mr. B. S. PUTTASWAMY.—Did he apply for the post here after finding that he could not get any job elsewhere?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—No information.

Mr. B. S. PUTTASWAMY.—To what place does he belong?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—I understand that he comes from the United Provinces.

Mr. B. S. PUTTASWAMY.—Are not the Government deputing any Mysoreans for studying for the F.R.C.S. examination?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—One or two went. And one has returned with that degree. He is in service now.

Mr. B. S. PUTTASWAMY.—Will the Government be pleased to depute, in future, young men for study for the F.R.C.S. examination?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—The member may separately represent to Government in that behalf.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—What is the exact place given to the newly appointed officer with reference to the officer already in service who also is an F.R.C.S.?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—That has not been considered.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—What service has the officer already in service put in?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—Notice.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—What is the pay of the newly appointed officer?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—Rs. 300.

Mr. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—What is the pay of the other officer?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—Rs. 200 *plus* Rs. 100.

Mr. PRESIDENT.—It would be better if the member confines himself to general questions instead of going into the relative merits of the two officers.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Should there not be special orders for appointing outsiders?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—Government have ordered the appointment.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Was there any advertisement calling for applications from candidates possessing F.R.C.S. qualification?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—No.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Then, how did he come to know that there was a vacancy in the Mysore State?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—He might have applied in the ordinary course.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Had he stipulated in his application the minimum salary on which alone he would accept the appointment?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—I believe, no.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Has not this new appointment resulted in the supersession of the officer already in service?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—No.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Why was not a Mysorean appointed?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—No Mysorean with F.R.C.S. qualification was available.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—If non-Mysoreans apply in future, will they be entertained in service?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—That is a hypothetical question.

Mr. T. MARIYAPPA.—Is it not the recognised policy of the Government that appointments in Mysore should be reserved for Mysoreans? If so, why was this outsider taken?

Mr. M. VENKATESA IYENGAR.—As already stated, F.R.C.S. is very

high medical qualification and that is why he was entertained.

Mr. M. A. GOPALASWAMY IYENGAR.—It was said that vacancies of Assistant Surgeons are not usually advertised and that medical probationers would be promoted to the grade of Assistant Surgeons. Then, where was the necessity for taking an outsider directly as Assistant Surgeon?

Mr. PRESIDENT.—It is not fair to take persons with that very high qualification as probationers. Neither would they accept such a post. This is an exceptional case. But it does not mean that the same procedure would be adopted in other cases.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—BILLS.—*contd.*

II. General Principles of the Bill for the Removal of Religious and Caste Disabilities.

Before explaining the general principles of the measure, **the GENERAL SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. M. Venkatesa Iyengar)** said that the main object of the bill was to leave the inheritance rights of persons born in one faith unaffected by their embracing another faith. For example, under the Hindu Law as in force at present, a member of a Hindu joint family, on conversion to another religion, forfeited his right to his share in the joint family property. A Mahomedan on conversion would lose the right to a share in his father's property which would be his if he continued a Mahomedan. With a view to remove this disability, the Religious and Caste Disabilities Removal Act was enacted in British India in 1850. The Christian Missionaries in the State had been representing the need for similar legislation in the State also. When it was urged once some time before the Rendition, *i.e.*, 1881, it was stated that the situation of the State was peculiar and the matter should be deferred. Cases occurred occasionally in courts which brought the question to prominence and in consequence, Government constituted in 1905 a Committee with Chief Justice Staley as Chairman to enquire into the necessity or otherwise of a measure like the British Indian Act and submit a report. It might interest the members to know that Sir K. P. Puttanna Chetty was a member of that committee. There were also a Mahomedan and an Indian Christian member on it. After detailed enquiry, the committee suggested that legislation be enacted to remove caste disabilities in the matter of inheritance, but proposed various safeguards to prevent hardship to persons related to the converts in other respects. Accordingly, a bill was framed and was placed before the Legislative Council of 1910. The House discussed it at great length and finally rejected it, and further consideration of the question was deferred for the time being. Twenty-five years had passed since then and with the march of time, social conditions and the outlook of the people had undergone considerable change. Government had therefore brought up the bill again to ascertain the opinion of the representatives of the people in the matter.

The measure before the House was not an exact copy of the Act in British India. In the British Indian Act, a person embracing another religion was freed from all disabilities. But certain restrictions had been imposed in the measure proposed in Mysore and now before the House. The idea behind the restrictions was that the convert should not acquire or retain or exercise any right which was peculiar or appropriate only to the religion from which he had seceded and should not be allowed to impose his preference for another faith on his wife or minor children.

Continuing, **Mr. VENKATESA IYENGAR** said that from the statement of general principles, it should be clear to members that the measure was a very innocent one. The bill had been published in the Gazette and public criticism was invited. So far as he was aware, only four objections had been received. What had been stated in those objections was that the bill had been thrown out in 1910 as not wanted and that as the people had